



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,249	11/16/2001	Scott A. Hunter	2435-045	5359

7590 04/23/2003

Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC  
Lewis S. Rowell  
300 North Greene Street  
1900 First Union Tower  
Greensboro, NC 27401

EXAMINER

RUDDOCK, ULA CORINNA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# FILE COPY

## Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/992,249	HUNTER, SCOTT A.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Ula C Ruddock	1771	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

4) Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 31-50 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 21-30 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4, 12, 15-17, and 20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 5-11, 13, 14, 18 and 19 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-30, drawn to a fabric filter, classified in class 442, subclass 59.
  - II. Claims 31-50, drawn to a filtering device, classified in class 96, subclass 4.
  - III. Claim 50, drawn to a method of making a filtering medium, classified in class 442, subclass 372.2.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful by itself and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

3. Inventions III and I & II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the product can be made by another process, i.e. by drying and heating the fabric one time only.

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. During a telephone conversation with Mr. Lewis Rowell on March 26, a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-30. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 31-51 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in –  
(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

7. Claims 1-3, 12, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wyss (US Pub. No. 2002/0006757). Wyss discloses a gas permeable fabric made from a porous substrate that treated with a composition comprising a fluoropolymer and a rigidizing film-forming material is disclosed (abstract). The substrate includes woven fiberglass [0010]. Fluoropolymers give the fabrics of the present invention chemical protection and lubricity; suitable fluoropolymers include PTFE in water [0012-0014].

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyss (US Pub. No. 2002/0006757), as shown above. Wyss discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching that the protective layer comprises 5-30% PTFE dispersion and about 70-95% water, and more specifically that the protective layer comprises about 20% PTFE dispersion and about 80% water. Wyss does disclose that the fluoropolymer is preferably present in an amount ranging from 1 to 30% by weight, more preferably to 20% by weight [0015]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have used 75-90% water or more specifically 80% water, motivated by the desire to complete the composition requirement.

10. Claims 4 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wyss (US Pub. No. 2002/0006757), as shown above, in view of Stark (US 6,008,146). Wyss discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching that the fiberglass is ECDE and that the filter is pleated. Stark discloses filter material comprising ECDE fiberglass (Sample A, col 8). The filter material of Stark is pleated. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used Stark's ECDE fiberglass as the fiberglass in Wyss' filter, motivated by the desire to create a filter that has greater durability. It also would have been obvious to have pleated the filter of Wyss as taught by Stark, motivated by the desire to create a filter having greater filter area and lower weight.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

11. ~~Claims 5-11, 13-14, and 18-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.~~

12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: no prior art was found to teach a stiffener with the composition required by claims 5-11 and a lubricant having the composition in claims 13-14.

13. Claims 21-30 are allowed.

***Conclusion***

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ula C Ruddock whose telephone number is 703-305-0066. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 703-308-2414. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

UCR *WLR*  
April 19, 2003

*Ula Ruddock*